

**SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to County Guidelines under Ordinance 3040 and Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Project Label:

APN: 1013-501-10*
Applicant: Centerstone Communities/Harry Keto
Proposal: A. General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use District from Single Residential, 1acre minimum (RS-1) to Single Residential, 20,000 SF minimum (RS-20m) and
B. Tent Tract 16396 to create 26 Lots on 15 Ac. with a wall height variance to maximum 9 feet.
Community: Chino/4th Supervisorial District
Location: Northwest corner of Humbolt Ave. and Philadelphia Ave., Roswell opposite Compton Ave.
JCS/INDEX: 12919CF1/W37-121/2003/TT16396/TT01/GPA01
Staff: Biron R. Bauer, Planner III
Rep: S. D. Engineering and Assoc.

USGS QUAD: Chino

T, R, SECTION: T01S R05W Sec. 34NE

THOMAS BROS.: 645/F2

PLANNING AREA: Chino

OLUD: RS-1

IMPROVEMENT LEVEL: 1

PROJECT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lead agency name and address:

San Bernardino County Land Use Services Department, Current Planning Division
385 N. Arrowhead Avenue, First Floor
San Bernardino, CA 92415-0182

Contact person and phone number: Biron R. Bauer- Phone: (909) 387-4109 Fax: (909) 387-3249

Project sponsor's name and address: Centerstone Communities, 3500-B W. Lake Ctr. Dr., Santa Ana, CA 92704

PROJECT DESCRIPTION - The proposed project is a General Plan Amendment (OLUD change) and Tentative Tract No. 16396 (26 lots) on 15 acres with a wall height variance to a maximum of 9 feet in two locations. The project is located on the northwest corner of Humbolt Ave. and Philadelphia St. approximately 330 feet west of Roswell Ave. which provide access to the site. Both are County maintained roads. This project site lies within the unincorporated area of the County of San Bernardino within the City of Chino's Sphere of Influence. The County General Plan designates the project site as an RS-1 (Single Residential District, one acre minimum parcel size), with an Improvement Level 1 (IL-1). The 26 proposed lots will be a minimum of 20,000 square feet each (with sizes ranging from 20,020 sf to 28,000 sf). The one and two story homes will be constructed by the applicant and will sell in the \$300,000 - 400,000 range. The lots along Roswell Ave. will be designed so that the new homes will face the street and blend with the other houses that now front on the relatively quiet, residential street. The other lots of the tract will be on cul de-sac streets. Only Loyola Court will be a private, semi-gated street.

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS: The site is undeveloped horse/livestock pasture/corrals.

AREA	EXISTING LAND USE	OFFICIAL LAND USE DISTRICT	IL
SITE	Vacant/Horse Pasture	RS-1 (Single Res., 1Ac. min. parcel)	IL-1
North	Elementary School	RS-1 (Single Res., 1Ac. min. parcel)	IL-1

South	Philadelphia St., Custom homes	RS-1 (Single Res., 1Ac. min. parcel)	IL-1
East	Single Family residences.	RS-1 (Single Res., 1Ac. min. parcel)	IL-1
West	Custom homes, Tr.16180	RS-20m(Single Res., 20m min. parcel)	IL-1

ENVIRONMENTAL/EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS (cont'd) :

The project site is currently a vacant, fenced, in-fill lot that is substantially disturbed by previous farming and agriculturally-related activities and more recently, adjacent home building.

Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Federal: None; State of California: Regional Water Quality Control Board, County of San Bernardino: Land Use Services - Code Enforcement; Building and Safety, Public Health-Environmental Health Services, Special Districts, Public Works. Chino Valley Independent Fire District.

Evaluation Format/Criteria:

This Initial Environmental Study is prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This format of the study is presented as follows. The project is evaluated based upon its effect on seventeen (17) major categories of environmental factors. Each factor is reviewed by responding to a series of questions regarding the impact of the project on each element of the overall factor. The Initial Study Checklist provides a formatted analysis that provides a determination of the effect of the project on the factor and its elements. The effect of the project is categorized into one of the following four categories of possible determinations:

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------

Substantiation is then provided to justify each determination. One of the four following conclusions is then provided as a summary of the analysis for each of the major environmental factors.

1. No impacts are identified or anticipated and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.
2. No significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and therefore, no mitigation measures are required.
3. Possible significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated and the following mitigation measures are required as a condition of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level below significant. The required mitigation measures are: (List mitigation measures)
4. Significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to evaluate these impacts, which are: (List the impacts requiring analysis within the EIR).

At the end of the analysis the required mitigation measures are restated and categorized as being either self-monitoring or as requiring a separate Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

1. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/ Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:

- ☒ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature (prepared by) Biron R. Bauer, Planner III

March 18, 2004
Date

Signature(prepared by) Julie M. Rynerson, AICP,
Division Chief Current Planning Division
For Land Use Services Director

Date

I. AESTHETICS — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	x
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check ___ if project is located within the view shed of any Scenic Route listed in the General Plan):

- I a) The proposed GPA/Tract No. 16396 project is not located within a designated Scenic Corridor and will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, as there are none identified within the vicinity of the project site that would be affected by the proposed development of the site. Large single and 2-story residences exist in the area.
- I b) The proposed GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway, because the site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway and there are no significant trees, rock outcroppings, or historic building on the project site.
- I c) The proposed GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not substantially degrade the existing, visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because the residential use project on ½ acre lots is compatible with the existing rural visual character of the area and will incorporate landscaping and provide screening walls.
- I d) The proposed GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, because standard street lighting proposed on site will be hooded and down shielded to protect surrounding properties from any resultant glare.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check ☐ if project is located in the Important Farmlands Overlay):

- II a) The subject property is not identified or designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The soils on-site are composed of Grangeville (GR) and Tujunga loamy sands (TuB) soil types. Both soil types are typically used for irrigated crops such as alfalfa, grains, corn silage, and pasture plants, limited grazing and for homesites and related uses. Although the project acreage has been used historically for agricultural purposes, it is not considered prime or unique farmland nor of Statewide Importance. It is surrounded by encroaching rural and urban development. The land use district change would complete the transition to urban residential uses. A significant impact is not anticipated and mitigation measures are not proposed. There are no active, productive agricultural uses or livestock grazing on the site, currently.
- II b) The subject property is designated RS-1 and the proposed use does not conflict with any agricultural land use or Williamson Act land conservation contract, as none of these “land banking” protections exist on this site.
- II c) The subject property is designated and the proposed GPA/Tract No. 16396 use does not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Prime Farmland, to a non-agricultural use. The soil of this area although not designated prime, has supported some row crops in the past.

Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

III. AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (discuss conformity with the *South Coast or Mojave Desert* Air Quality Management Plan, if applicable):

- III a) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the *South Coast* air quality plan, because the proposed uses do not exceed the thresholds established for air quality concerns as established by the CEQA Air Quality Handbook developed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The traffic increase for (26) new lots (maximum 26 houses in future) is not significant based on the handbook criteria and will not exceed the threshold level of significance nor contribute in any substantial way to the degradation of local region air quality. The site will be partly paved, built upon and landscaped which will mean little potential for wind-blown dust or particulate matter.

- III b) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed use(s) do not exceed established thresholds of concern as established by the District. A dust/erosion control plan will be required for the 15 acres as a normal condition of approval to regulate construction activities and reduce the potential for wind-blown dust.
- III c) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors), because the proposed uses do not exceed established thresholds of concern.
- III d) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, because there are no identified concentrations of substantial pollutants and the project is not located within ¼ mile of a use considered a 'sensitive receptor'.
- III e) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not create odors affecting a substantial number of people because there are no identified potential uses that will result in the production of objectionable odors, apart from continued nearby agricultural-related smells.

No potential significant adverse impacts have been identified or anticipated, with the application of normal conditions of approval, therefore no mitigation measures are required as conditions of project approval to reduce these impacts to a level of below significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check if project is located in the Biological Resources Overlay or contains habitat for any species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database):

- IV a) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, because the project site is a previously disturbed lot that has no such biological resources identified on the site.
- IV b) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service because the project site is a previously disturbed lot that has no such blue-line stream, biological resources, riparian habitat or sensitive natural plant/animal community identified on site.
- IV c) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, because the project is not within an identified protected wetland.
- IV d) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, because there are no such known corridors or nursery sites within or near the project site.
- IV e) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, as the site has been previously disturbed for animal grazing and there are no identified biological resources that are subject to such regulation.
- IV f) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, because no such plan has been adopted in the area of the project site. The Prado Basin Regional Park property farther south may accommodate some of these regional wetlands concerns.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check if the project is located in the Cultural___or Paleontologic ___ Resources overlays or cite results of cultural resource review):

- V a) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, because there are no such resources identified on the site.
- V b) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not cause a substantial adverse change to an archaeological resource, because there are no such resources identified on the site
- V c) This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, because no such resources have been mapped or identified on the site according to the County Museum.
- V d) - This GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, because no such burials grounds are identified on or near this project site. If any human remains are discovered, during construction of this project, the developer is required to contact the County Coroner, County Museum.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS— Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist -Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 181-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check _ if project is located in the Geologic Hazards Overlay District):

- VI a) (i-iv) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving; i) rupture of a known earthquake fault, ii) strong seismic ground shaking, iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction or iv) Landslides, because there are no such topographic features or geologic hazards identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The project will be reviewed and approved by County Building and Safety with appropriate seismic standards.
- VI b) – The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil, because the site will be substantially paved and landscaped. Normal erosion control plans will be required to be submitted, approved and implemented.
- VI c) – The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project is not identified as being located on a geologic unit or soil that has been identified as being unstable or having the potential to result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Where a potential for these is identified a geology report is required to be reviewed and approved by the County Building and Safety Geologist, who will require implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, if any are required
- VI d) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project site is not located in an area which has been identified by the County Building and Safety Geologist as having the potential for expansive soils, as determined by a required soils report.
- VI e) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project has soils capable of supporting septic tanks and normal, single-family, subsurface, sewage disposal systems. The soil type is Grangeville (GR) and Tujunga (TuB), consisting of somewhat poorly drained, nearly level soils, formed on the slopes of alluvial fans in moderately coarse-textured, granitic alluvium. The surface layer is grayish-brown fine sandy loam about 12 inches thick. The soil type is moderately rapidly permeable, making it suitable for septic systems, which are currently utilized throughout the study area for waste disposal. The applicant is currently proposing connecting the project to the existing sanitary sewer system under the jurisdiction of the City of Chino. There are no unique landforms, as the project site is relatively flat. There are no known geological hazards except for the fact that the entire valley is a seismically active area, subject to severe ground shaking. New development will be required to conform to the Uniform Building Code requirements for earthquake-prone areas. Except during the construction process, when soil erosion control systems will be required, the project will not result in significant soil erosion and the area will be paved, built upon and landscaped, reducing potential blown dust to a minimum.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS —

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where
:

such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	--------------------------	--------------

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

SUBSTANTIATION:

VII a) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, because no residential use approved on the site is anticipated to be involved in such activities. If any such uses are proposed on-site in the future, they will be subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.

VII b) The residential project will not create in and of itself a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, because none are proposed and any proposed use or construction activity that might use hazardous materials is subject to permit and inspection by the Hazardous Materials Division of the County Fire Department.

VII c) The residential project uses will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, because the project does not propose the use of hazardous materials and all existing and the only existing school is Bloomington High School, to the east of Alder Ave., which will not be affected by residential construction.

VII d) The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites.

VII e) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a public airport.

VII f) The project site is not within the vicinity or approach/departure flight path of a private airstrip.

VII g) The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, because the project has adequate access from two or more directions.

VII h) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, because there are no wildlands remaining adjacent to this site.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level, which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- VIII a) The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, because the project will be served by established water and wastewater purveyors that are subject to independent regulation by local and state agencies that ensure compliance with both water quality and waste discharge requirements.
- VIII b) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, because the project is served by an existing water purveyor that has indicated that there is currently sufficient capacity in the existing water system to serve the anticipated needs of this project.

- VIII c) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, because the project does not propose any substantial alteration to a drainage pattern, stream or river and the project is required to submit and implement an erosion control plan.
- VIII d) The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, because the project does not propose any substantial alteration to an established drainage pattern, or any existing stream or river. County Public Works has reviewed the proposed project drainage and all necessary drainage improvements both on and off site have been required as normal conditions of the construction of the project.
- VIII e) The project will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, because County Public Works has reviewed the proposed project drainage and has determined that the proposed systems are adequate to handle anticipated flows. All necessary drainage improvements both on and off site will be required as conditions of the construction of the project. There will be adequate capacity in the local and regional drainage systems so that downstream properties are not negatively impacted by any increases or changes in runoff volume, velocity or direction of storm water flows originating from or altered by the project.
- VIII f) – The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality, because appropriate measures relating to water quality protection, including erosion control measures have been required. The study area is not in a flood hazard zone, nor is it subject to dam inundation. Ground water quality is already impacted with the historical use of agricultural fertilizers and the proliferation of septic systems in this area. The Land Use District Change, in and of itself, is not anticipated to pose any significant impact to ground water quality. The applicant is currently proposing connection to the City of Chino’s sanitary sewer system.
- VIII g) The project will not place unprotected housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, because the project has been reviewed by County Public Works and the project is not within identified flood hazard areas. (Or: appropriate protection mechanisms, (such as elevation of the building sites for habitable structures) have been required as a conditions of construction of the project.
- VIII h) The project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, because the site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and any area identified as being potentially affected by a 100-year storm the structures will be subject to a flood hazard review and will be required to be elevated a minimum of one foot above the base flood elevation.
- VIII i) The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam, because neither detention structure exists in the area. The project site is not within any identified path of a potential inundation flow that might result in the event of a dam or levee failure or that might occur from a river, stream, lake or sheet flow situation.
- VIII j) The project will not be impacted by inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, because the project is not adjacent to any body of water that has the potential of seiche or tsunami nor is the project site in the path of any potential mudflow from a higher elevation.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- IX a) The project will not physically divide an established community, because the project is a logical and orderly extension of the planned residential land uses and development that are established within the surrounding area.
- IX b) The project will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, because the project is consistent with applicable land use policies and regulations of the County Code and General Plan. The City of Chino, within whose sphere of influence the project is contained, has indicated that they will support the project and permit connection to their public sewer system provided the applicant agrees to comply with certain conditions of approval. The area is in a state of transition from residual agricultural to urban residential land uses. The project site is clearly urban-impacted. The project will not divide an established community but rather enhance it by providing 26 desirable, upscale, ½-acre, residential lots. .
- IX c) The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, because there is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan within the area surrounding the project site and no habitat conservation lands are required to be purchase as mitigation for the proposed project.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

X.MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check ___ if project is located within the Mineral Resource Zone Overlay):

- X a) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, because there are no identified important mineral resources on the project site and the site is not within a Mineral Resource Zone Overlay.
- X b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan, because there are no identified locally important mineral resources on the project site.

Therefore, no impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XI. NOISE — Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION (check if the project is located in the Noise Hazard Overlay District ____ or is subject to severe noise levels according to the General Plan Noise Element __):

- XI a) The project will not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, because the project has been conditioned to comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the proposed low density residential uses.
- XI b)– The project will not create exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels, because the project has been conditioned to comply with the vibration standards of the County Development Code and no vibration exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the proposed uses.
- XI c)– The project will not generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, because the project must comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code and no noise exceeding these standards is anticipated to be generated by the project.
- XI d) The project will not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, because the project must comply with the noise standards of the County Development Code. Tract construction activity shall be limited to the hours between 7 AM and 7 PM, each day. Construction equipment is required to be staged away from any surrounding residences.
- XI e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan area or within 2 miles of a public/public use airport.
- XI f) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XII a) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area either directly or indirectly nor add significantly to the amount of housing stock in the study area.
- XII b) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing, because no housing units are proposed to be demolished as a result of this proposal.
- XII c) The proposed use will not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, because the project will not displace, but add to, any existing housing or existing residents. With the change from RS-1 to allow 20,000 square foot lots, the unit density will be 1.65 units per acre, which is not a significant increase. This increase will not stimulate substantial population growth, nor will it displace existing housing since the site is currently vacant.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES —

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XIII a) The proposed 26-Lot subdivision project is small enough to not result in *substantial adverse physical impacts* associated with the provision of any new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services, including fire and police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. Construction of the project over the next several years has the propensity to increase property tax revenues enough to provide an additional source of funding that is believed to be sufficient to offset the very minor increases in the anticipated demands for public services generated by this project.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XIV. RECREATION —

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XIV a) This project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities (such as high school) such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, because the project will not generate a significant number of new residential units and the impacts generated by the *residents* of this project will be minimal. The high school property is across the street to the east. Horseback riding on and off-site will continue and the local trail system will eventually provide connections to the Santa Ana River trail areas.
- XIV b) This project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment, because the type of project proposed will not result in an increased demand for recreational facilities. The larger 20m yards provide on-site amenity.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XV a) The project will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, because the increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, and the congestion level at intersections remains below the planned thresholds for those facilities
- XV b) The project will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service {LOS} standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways, because County Public Works, Traffic Division has reviewed the traffic generation of the proposed project and anticipates that traffic service will remain at an LOS of "C" or better, as required by the County General Plan. A Traffic Study, dated February 04, 2004, was prepared for this project by Lawrence Eisenhart, Consulting Engineer. The study indicated that the level of service (LOS) at Humbolt Ave. and Philadelphia Avenue is currently at LOS "B". With the project now and in the year 2020, the study estimates that the level of service will remain LOS "B". At the intersection of Philadelphia and Roswell Ave., the current level of service is LOS "B". The study estimates that the level of service with the project will remain at LOS "B" in 2001 and reduce to LOS "C" in the year 2020. The traffic report states that the two intersections are currently operating at acceptable levels of service and with the project road improvements will continue to operate at acceptable levels. The report concludes that no traffic mitigation is required.
- XV c) The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, because there are no airports in the vicinity of the project and there is no anticipated notable impact on air traffic volumes by passengers or freight generated by the proposed uses and no new air traffic facilities are proposed.
- XV d) The project will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, because the project site is adjacent to an established road that is accessed at points with good site distance and properly controlled intersections. There are no incompatible uses proposed by the project that will impact surrounding land uses.
- XV e) The project will not result in inadequate emergency access, because there are a minimum of two access points.
- XV f) The project will not result in inadequate parking capacity, because the project meets the parking standards established by the County Development Code, including double garages for inside parking.
- XV g) The project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS —

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

- XVI a) The proposed project does not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region, as determined by County Public Health, Environmental Health Services as one-half acre lots are proposed. The project, however, will connect to the City of Chino Sanitary Sewer System.
- XVI b) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, as there is sufficient capacity in the existing system for the proposed use.
- XVI c) The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities that cause significant environmental effects, as County Public Works has determined that there is sufficient capacity in the existing storm water system to absorb any additional storm water drainage caused by the project and has only required facility refinement as a part of this project. Drainage facility refinement that is required is included in this environmental review and this review has not necessitated mitigation measures..
- XVI d) The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, as the local water purveyor the Monte Vista Water District has given assurance of such water service.
- XVI e) The proposed project has a determination from the wastewater treatment provider serving the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projected demand for the project in addition to the provider's existing commitments. The project is currently proposed for connection to the City of Chino's sanitary sewer system. If sewer connection for any reason should be denied, the project proposes lot sizes averaging 20,000 square feet, which

should be adequate area for septic systems, according to the S. A. Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Official Land Use District (OLUD) change from RS-1 will result in a change of density which will contribute marginally to sheet flow run-off by reducing lot size from one acre to 20,000 square feet, and allow for paving of driveways and streets. Drainage improvements will be required as part of the project's conditions of approval, which are expected to improve some longer-standing, area-wide, drainage problems.

XVI f) The proposed project is served by a county landfill(s) which has sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in the landfill. Since the Milliken Landfill closed on December 7, 1999, the waste stream from this area has been redirected either out of the County or to one of the remaining valley landfills: Mid-Valley, Colton or San Timoteo. The Mid-Valley Landfill does currently have the capacity to absorb this incremental trash increase, however, planned expansion will ensure that there is adequate capacity to serve all County needs for the next 25-40 years.

XVI g) The proposed project is required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause Substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly Or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

SUBSTANTIATION:

XVII a) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project does not appear to have the potential to significantly degrade the overall quality of the regions's environment, or substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. There are *no rare or endangered species* or other species of plants or animals or habitat identified as being significantly and negatively impacted by this project. The project site is urban-impacted with no potential for significant impact on endangered species or habitat. The area has been in transition from rural agricultural land uses from the time the area was changed in 1989 from Limited Agriculture (A-1) to RS Single

Residential land uses. There are no identified historic, archaeological, paleontological or prehistoric resources identified on this site.

XVII b) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The sites of other projects in the area to which this project would add cumulative impacts have either existing or planned infrastructure that is sufficient for all planned uses. These sites either are occupied or are capable of absorbing such planned uses without generating any cumulatively significant impacts. The General Plan Amendment from RS-1 to RS-20M is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan to encourage safe, attractive, compatible residential developments. The Infrastructure Improvement Level One remains and thus, there will be no change in infrastructure improvement level. The residential unit density will increase from approximately 1 unit per acre to 1.65 units per acre, which is not considered a significant increase. As a true “in-fill” project, the existing services/utilities in the area will be able to accommodate the additional residential uses which will result from this change.. There are no significant adverse impacts anticipated to result from the adoption of this General Plan Amendment.

Tentative Tract 16396 will, if approved, result in the creation of an attractive, upscale, partly-gated, residential project on estate-sized lots with private/public roads, part of which will be taken into the County-Maintained System. This Initial Study has not identified any significant impacts, and any less than significant impact will be mitigated to a level even lower than significant through the implementation/condition compliance of the standard conditions of approval.

XVII c) The GPA/Tract No. 16396 project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, as there are no such impacts identified by the studies conducted for this project or identified by review of other sources or by other agencies.

Only minor increases in traffic, emissions and noise will be created by implementation of the proposed project. These potential impacts have been thoroughly evaluated and have been deemed to be neither individually significant nor cumulatively considerable in terms of any adverse affects upon the region, the local community or its inhabitants. At a minimum, the project will be required to meet the normal conditions of approval for the modest project to be implemented. It is anticipated that all such conditions of approval will adequately insure that no potential for adverse impacts will be introduced by construction activities, initial or future land uses authorized by the project approval.

Therefore, no significant adverse impacts are identified or anticipated and no mitigation measures are required.

VIII. MITIGATION MEASURES

Note: Any mitigation measures which are not ‘self-monitoring’ shall have a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared and adopted at time of project approval. No unique Mitigation Measures are required as a part of this modest tract project as project standard conditions of approval address the normal development requirements.

REFERENCES (List author or agency, date, title)

Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act Map Series (PRC 27500)

California Department of Water Resources, Bulletin #118 (Critical Regional Aquifers), 1975.

CEQA Guidelines, Appendix

California Standard Specifications, July 1992

County Museum Archaeological Information Center

County of San Bernardino, Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, March 1995

County of San Bernardino Development Code, revised 2002

County of San Bernardino General Plan, adopted 1989, revised 2002

County of San Bernardino Hazard Overlay Maps

County of San Bernardino Identified Hazardous Materials Waste Sites List, April 1998

County Road Planning and Design Standards

Environmental Impact Report, San Bernardino County General Plan, 1989

Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map and Flood Boundary Map

Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District, Mojave Desert Planning Area – Federal Particulate Matter (PM10) Attainment Plan, July 1995

South Coast Air Quality Management District, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November 1993

Traffic Report, dated January 20, 2004, by Lawrence Eisenhart, Consulting Engineer